

freer trade without leaving substantial numbers of our residents jobless and workers abroad without basic labor rights. Confronted with a similar situation, the European Economic Community, now the European Union [EU], adopted an aggressive, transitional economic program to bring developing countries, such as Portugal and Spain, to the point where these less developed countries would not be sacrificed for free trade. This transitional aid enabled them to be full partners not only to their benefit but to the greater benefit of free trade in the entire EU.

Supporters of fast track like to point out that since 1992, over 11 million new jobs have been created, that of these, 1.5 million have been high-wage, export-related jobs, and that much of this job growth can be attributed to passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. By the administration's assessment, NAFTA has created up to 160,000 new jobs. What supporters of fast track conveniently ignore is that, at the same time, we have lost jobs in other sectors of our economy. The Department of Labor has estimated that NAFTA has led directly to the loss of about 150,000 jobs and has found that two-thirds of Americans who lose their jobs because of foreign trade end up with work that pays less than they earned before. Clearly, this is not a case where a rising tide lifts all boats; while some are cruising along, others are sinking. Transitional assistance has mitigated this inevitable adverse effect in the EU. H.R. 2621 simply leaves the hapless victims to fend for themselves against economic forces they cannot possibly control on their own. Precedents such as the EU assistance, however, show that these forces can be controlled consistent with free trade. Where is the comparable assistance in H.R. 2621?

How wasteful and unnecessary to divide Americans further into economic winners and losers. That is exactly what the Republican fast track proposal will do. In order to ensure that free trade also results in fair trade, fast track must authorize the President to negotiate strong and enforceable labor and environmental standards within the main body of any future trade agreement. Otherwise, businesses have shown that they cannot resist the temptation to move their manufacturing facilities to take advantage of low wages and lax enforcement of environmental standards and labor rights in developing countries. This fast track bill is fundamentally flawed because it allows American manufacturers to exploit foreign workers, to the ultimate detriment of workers here at home. The failure of this fast track proposal to establish protection of worker rights as a central tenet of U.S. trade policy is one of the important reasons why I oppose H.R. 2621.

I am particularly alarmed at how the current fast track proposal would allow U.S. manufacturers to enter into a race to the bottom on the environment. This fast track bill fails to ensure that trading partners compete fairly by requiring all parties to vigorously enforce environmental laws. Indeed, I am puzzled at the administration's failure to insist that environmental issues be addressed squarely in international trade agreements—that position only sends a signal to the world that the United States is not really serious about preserving the environment and will undermine our negotiating position at the upcoming Kyoto summit on global warming. We have fought too hard

and come too far to see our fragile environmental progress unravel in trade agreements.

Until fast track explicitly addresses worker rights here and in the countries covered by trade agreements and equally so the substantial environmental issues that beg to be addressed, I cannot support it. I ask the administration and supporters here in Congress to go back to the drawing board. We can do much better.

#### COMMENDING RUDY GUNNERMAN OF RENO, NV

#### HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. Rudy Gunnerman for not only living the American dream and creating a future for himself and his family but also for working to create a better future for all Americans. Mr. Gunnerman's entrepreneurial spirit and ingenuity have resulted in a scientific discovery to fight air pollution. This invention will not only assist communities across our country meet clean air standards, but also help them do so in a cost competitive manner. I am proud that he has chosen Reno, my hometown, to be his home and the corporate base of operation for the refinement and potential production of his invention—A-55 Clean Fuels.

Rudy Gunnerman embodies the American dream. In 1949, he emigrated from Germany to the United States. Rudy was raised an orphan during World War II and arrived in America at the age of 21 with \$20 and a single suitcase. His first months in America were spent painting houses. From this, he started a string of successful companies honing his entrepreneurial skills.

Rudy's inventive mind was always at work, looking for ways to better our quality of life through science. His initial patent was in heat barrier materials. Rudy utilized his experience in the manufacture of pool toys and began working with lightweight and inexpensive cement-like materials that under extreme conditions would reflect heat through oxidations. The Federal Government applied Rudy's technology for use in rocket engines liners and laser countermeasures. Rudy subsequently founded a company that began making fireproof doors out of the material.

Rudy's big break came in the 1970's while living in Oregon when he noticed how the wood smoke choked beautiful valleys during the winter. In 1976, Rudy opened a small research and development company in Eugene, OR, to produce pelletized industrial boiler fuel from wood paste. The pellets burned hotter and cleaner than raw wood waste, and proved to be economical as well. Ultimately, Rudy's company sold licenses to some of world's largest corporations to produce pellets in several countries. Schools, hospitals, factories, and homes across the Pacific Northwest also switched to pellets.

This was just the prelude. Rudy's most challenging and far-reaching invention brought him to Reno, NV. A-55 Clean Fuels is a water-based petroleum emulsion that 1 day may provide a cleaner, safer, and cheaper primary fuel with a full range of applications—from elec-

tricity production to mass transportation. The product is making a difference nationwide and internationally A-55 reduced harmful NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from 50 to 80 percent.

For vehicle use, only a minor change in the injection system and an empty fuel tank would be necessary for conversion to A-55 use. A-55 achieves nearly the same miles per gallon with no loss of engine performance. A-55 is safer than conventional petroleum fuels. It will not ignite outside the combustion chamber, and in fact, will often put out an open flame. Many alternative fuels in the past have also been prohibitively expensive compared to traditional fuels. This is not the case for A-55, which is cost competitive with diesel.

With Clean Air Act standards imminent by 2004, A-55 could be the silver bullet to help communities cope with requirements and reduce air pollution without feared economic side effects. A-55 Clean Fuels looks like milk and could very well be the next natural for protecting our environment and promoting economic growth.

Rudy Gunnerman should be applauded for his inventions and the opportunities they may 1 day provide for all of us to assist in the cleanup of air pollution across the country. Rudy Gunnerman's life is a shining example of the opportunities that America can offer and the contributions that one can give back to society through those very opportunities. With all this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I again commend Reno's own Rudy Gunnerman—entrepreneur, inventor, American.

#### FAST TRACK

#### HON. JAY W. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to those in opposition to fast track trade authority for the President. This fast track legislation provides a procedure for approval or denial of trade treaties, without giving Congress an opportunity to amend the treaties.

I believe strongly in free and open trade, and I have voted for other free trade legislation in this Congress. Trade is often the engine that drives our economy, opening up new markets for our goods and services.

However, too often in our recent trade agreements, like NAFTA and GATT, we have opened the doors of trade for other countries to sell their goods in this country, but slammed shut those doors when our workers and farmers looked to export their products abroad. Currently, dairy farmers in northeast Wisconsin face excessive trade barriers—tariffs as high as 300 percent in some cases—when they trade with Canada. Yet, Canadian dairy products flow freely across the same border. How can Americans compete when the playing field is so tilted to our competitor?

Last month, the Dairy Trade Coalition—comprised largely of Midwestern milk producers—said that the U.S. dairy industry was a big loser under the GATT Uruguay trade talks, and informed U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman that they could not support the fast track legislation without better assurances for agriculture. These assurances have been made and our farmers across America continue to struggle.

Mr. Speaker, after much consideration and many discussions with farmers and workers in northeast Wisconsin, I have concluded that it makes no sense to continue opening trade pacts in this hemisphere when we have faulty trade agreements—like NAFTA and GATT—that are hurting our people back home. Before we set out on a fast track to the bargaining table to negotiate our next trade agreement, the President would do well to fix these recent agreements and level the playing field for the United States.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
CONTRACTING PRACTICES

SPEECH OF

**HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 12, 1997*

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the revitalization of our Nation's Capital will require the participation and commitment of both the public and private sectors. Public-private partnerships will be the anchor of any economic revitalization. This goal will be successful only if all participants are assured that this is a sincere effort, with a level playing field, and not simply an extension of the two decades of poor policy decisionmaking that helped spiral Washington, DC into its recent situation.

The Congress has no desire to run the daily affairs of the city. However, the Congress does have a unique constitutional responsibility to the District of Columbia. Without micro-managing the affairs of the city, the Congress does need to ensure that as a matter of Federal policy, it will support public-private efforts designed to assist in the Capital's revitalization; support creative, imaginative, and unique approaches; support the streamlining of the Federal and District of Columbia review and regulatory processes, where appropriate, to encourage revitalization; and exercise appropriate oversight to ensure that the District honors all of its contractual and financial commitments.

It is well understood by the Congress that the District of Columbia continues to suffer from past financial problems. For example, the District of Columbia has experienced issues with a number of its current vendors as a result of its prior reputation of poor payment performance. A recent newspaper article documented that one of the reasons for schools not having textbooks was " \* \* \* twelve textbook companies refused to ship books because the District still owes for previous orders."

Prior negligence in these matters created a ripple effect that has a broad and negative reach. Vendors have been discouraged from responding to District of Columbia RFP's because of concerns over the selection process. Congress can assist in eliminating this perception without direct intervention. Congress can also assure all current and prospective private sector partners and their respective lenders that it will monitor and respond appropriately to any failing by the government of the District of Columbia to meet acceptable Government contracting practices.

"DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1998"

**HON. MAJOR R. OWENS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 13, 1997*

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the census language in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill H.R. 2267, because it would jeopardize a fair and accurate count of the U.S. population. In true Republican form, the majority has once again politicized an issue that is as straightforward as the science behind statistical sampling. In a self-serving and subtle racist effort to maintain control of Congress, some Republicans are hampering the Democratic effort to ensure that all Americans are counted in the Decennial Census.

H.R. 2267 would allow opponents of sampling to file lawsuits in Federal courts to block the use of sampling in the 2000 census. It also gives unprecedented power to the Speaker of the House to sue on behalf of the House to block sampling and to use resources of the House counsel or outside counsel to pursue such litigation. Finally, the bill is plagued with partisan language which states that statistical sampling "poses the risk of an inaccurate, invalid and unconstitutional census."

It is unfortunate and unconscionable that while we have the tools to obtain an accurate count in the 2000 census, some in Congress continue to object to the use of statistical sampling. We can use statistical sampling to transcend socioeconomic barriers that have historically restricted an accurate count. In the last census, almost four million Americans were not counted because of the antiquated counting method that was used. That means that 1.6 percent of our population was not counted. The current counting method relies on a door-to-door count of every person in the Nation. This method is neither the most efficient nor is it cost effective. The Census Bureau estimates that nearly five million Americans will not be counted in the 2000 census if the traditional methods are used.

Faced with past failures, it is only logical that we should use all of our existing resources to achieve a fair and accurate count. Scientists have concluded that it is close to impossible to physically count each and every person in the United States. Statistical sampling has been universally accepted by the scientific community as the best way to conduct the 2000 census. The Census Bureau would simply account for those residents it cannot count. Sampling is a scientific method endorsed by the American Statistical Society, the General Accounting Office, and the National Academy of Sciences.

In light of all of these facts, we must ask ourselves: Why does the Republican majority continue to oppose sampling? The answer lies in who the census undercounts when sampling is not employed. Studies have concluded that the undercount is not uniform across the population. Minorities, particularly in urban areas, are grossly undercounted by traditional methods. This leads me to conclude that race has become an underlying factor in the 2000 census debate and raises more questions about why statistical sampling has come under

attack by Republicans. The results from the census determine how Federal funds are allocated to the localities as well as how congressional seats are distributed among States. For instance, census data determines how certain public works funds are distributed, the creation of Federal empowerment zones, the establishment of fair market rent values, and the need for equal employment opportunities programs. Only through sampling can we ensure that States receive their fair share of Federal funds and programs. Since minorities have historically supported the Democratic Party, I believe that Republicans are positioning themselves to maintain power by depriving minorities of scarce Federal funds and representation in the Congress.

It is immoral and undemocratic for anyone to support a proposal that would deny the Census Bureau the vehicle to count each and every American. In a major and unprecedented move to mend the sad state of race relations, President Clinton has created an "Initiative on Race." It is rather ironic that Republicans are trying to turn back the clock by refusing to have a census that counts not just their supporters but every American. While we all know that American history is rampant with instances of prejudice and racism, it is unfortunate that this Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill will add another pathetic chapter to that piece of history we are trying so hard to heal.

PRISONER OF WAR/MISSING IN  
ACTION RECOGNITION DAY

**HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 13, 1997*

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request unanimous consent to include the following proclamation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have always been a strong supporter of efforts to help our POW/MIA's and their families.

The following is the text of the Massachusetts' proclamation declaring September 19, 1997, as Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Day:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS—A  
PROCLAMATION

(By His Excellency Governor Argeo Paul  
Cellucci, 1997)

Whereas: In each of our country's wars, American prisoners of war have made tremendous sacrifices for our nation, enduring the burdens of loneliness, trauma, and hardship; and

Whereas: Prisoners of war have at times endured treatment at the hands of the enemy that is in violation of common human compassion, ethical standards, and international agreements; and

Whereas: In a time when we enjoy the blessings of peace, it is appropriate that all citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts recognize the special debt owed to those Americans held as prisoners of war; and

Whereas: It is also appropriate that we remember the unresolved casualties of war and those soldiers for whom we have not yet accounted; and

Whereas: Since the pain and bitterness of war endures for the families, relatives, and friends of those whose fates are unknown, we